

Lori Peckol

From: FAY CAWLEY [bigboris@verizon.net]
Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2007 12:26 PM
To: Lori Peckol
Subject: Overlake

Dear Robert Odle and Lori Peckol:

Thank-you for the mailing about the discussion of the Overlake area community. We are unable to come to the meeting but would like to respond with these thoughts:

If making taller buildings will free up surface space – that is a great idea.

It is our idea that the freed up surface space should be used for parks & traffic solutions (park & ride is a great idea).

The taller buildings should have inclusive parking or dedicated multi-story structures similar to those at Redmond Town Center.

Overlake could use some nice green space (and outside artwork as well).

Currently Overlake could use some charm - a "center/gathering place".

Our retired neighbors all complain about the traffic on 148th – other than 520, could a loop be created?

Good luck and many thanks for accepting our ideas.

Sincerely,

Patrick & Fay Cawley
6008 – 150th Court NE
Redmond, WA 98052

05/21/2007

Jayme Jonas

From: Godo, Erik [erik.godo@boeing.com]
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2007 10:12 AM
To: Godo, Erik; Jayme Jonas
Cc: Lori Peckol
Subject: RE: Overlake rules change - group health and other

Sorry - one more - where would the light rail station be? I don't see that in the reports I have looked at.

Erik Godo
787 Landing Gear Systems - Software
phone: 425-717-5836 (forwards to cell)
cell: 425-736-4364

From: Godo, Erik
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2007 10:11 AM
To: 'Jayme Jonas'
Cc: Lori Peckol
Subject: RE: Overlake rules change - group health and other

How do I watch via the web? I'm a non-cable holdout so my kids watch less tv.

Hmm - hard for me to figure out what the changes are from the text - unless it is all changes. There is a lot of good information there in the reports.
So what is your response to the amendment? Don't see that on there.

Looks like you are limited by the city boundary - where do you show how your vision and Bellevue's vision match up?

The hotel is a good idea - Microsoft uses up a lot of conference meeting room space across all of redmond/bellevue. They even use up movie theaters during the day.

I would be inclined to allow the extra height if they add more than required parking to support that height. That would be the give and take.

Erik Godo
cell: 425-736-4364

From: Jayme Jonas [mailto:JJONAS@redmond.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2007 9:18 AM
To: Godo, Erik
Cc: Lori Peckol
Subject: RE: Overlake rules change - group health and other

Erik-

06/12/2007

Jayme Jonas

From: Godo, Erik [erik.godo@boeing.com]
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2007 10:11 AM
To: Jayme Jonas
Cc: Lori Peckol
Subject: RE: Overlake rules change - group health and other

How do I watch via the web? I'm a non-cable holdout so my kids watch less tv.

Hmm - hard for me to figure out what the changes are from the text - unless it is all changes. There is a lot of good information there in the reports.

So what is your response to the amendment? Don't see that on there.

Looks like you are limited by the city boundary - where do you show how your vision and Bellevue's vision match up?

The hotel is a good idea - Microsoft uses up a lot of conference meeting room space across all of redmond/bellevue. They even use up movie theaters during the day.

I would be inclined to allow the extra height if they add more than required parking to support that height. That would be the give and take.

Erik Godo
cell: 425-736-4364

From: Jayme Jonas [mailto:JJONAS@redmond.gov]
Sent: Monday, May 21, 2007 9:18 AM
To: Godo, Erik
Cc: Lori Peckol
Subject: RE: Overlake rules change - group health and other

Erik-

You are now on our email distribution list for the Overlake and Group Health amendments. You can find the proposed amendments at the bottom of this page:

<http://www.redmond.gov/insidecityhall/boards/planningreview.asp>. The amendments will be going to Planning Commission for the first time this Wednesday, May 23rd. An introduction to both amendments is scheduled for 8:30pm - you can watch the presentation and discussion on RCTV channel 21, on the web, or in person at Redmond City Hall in the Council Chambers.

A public hearing is scheduled for next Wednesday, May 30th, and you are welcome to comment on the amendments in person at that time. You can also submit additional written comments. Please let me know if you have any questions.

We thank you for your comments about the Group Health property. Their proposed amendment is structured in such a way as to encourage significant housing development on the site, along with some retail and office uses and open spaces. Building height up to 8 stories for mixed-use or residential buildings is being considered for a larger portion of Overlake (what we are calling Overlake Village, or what is currently the shopping area) while Group Health is proposing residential heights up to 12 stories and commercial building heights up to 9 stories.

Thanks again for your interest in the Overlake and Group Health proposed amendments. Please let us know if

06/12/2007

you have any additional questions or comments.

Thanks,
Jayme Jonas

Jayme Jonas, Assistant Planner
Redmond Planning Department
15670 NE 85th Street, MS 4SPL
Redmond, WA 98073-9710
Phone: (425) 556-2496
Email: jjonas@redmond.gov

-----Original Message-----

From: Godo, Erik [<mailto:erik.godo@boeing.com>]
Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2007 9:48 AM
To: Lori Peckol; Jayme Jonas
Subject: Overlake rules change - group health and other

Please add me to your e-mail distribution for this. I think we can do some give and take with Group Health in general. I would be more interested in more high-density residential (multi-story (5-8) condos or apartments) than commercial in that location since Microsoft is such a powerhouse and a lot of retail is very close. Microsoft, of course, will want more office space they can lease. Can you point me to the amendments? Some sort of presentation on your web site?

Erik Godo
15208 NE 63RD CT
Redmond Wa
cell: 425-736-4364

06/12/2007

Lori Peckol

From: Godo, Erik [erik.godo@boeing.com]
Sent: Saturday, May 19, 2007 9:48 AM
To: Lori Peckol; Jayme Jonas
Subject: Overlake rules change - group health and other

Please add me to your e-mail distribution for this. I think we can do some give and take with Group Health in general. I would be more interested in more high-density residential (multi-story (5-8) condos or apartments) than commercial in that location since Microsoft is such a powerhouse and a lot of retail is very close. Microsoft, of course, will want more office space they can lease. Can you point me to the amendments? Some sort of presentation on your web site?

Erik Godo
15208 NE 63RD CT
Redmond Wa
cell: 425-736-4364

Planning and Com. Delvp.
Redmond WA.

May 21, 2007

Subject: Letter of amendments

Dear Mr. Robert G. Odle, Dir.

RECEIVED
MAY 21 2007
PLANNING DEPT.
CITY OF REDMOND

Thank you for your letter of May 16 telling me what is not really going to happen after you restructure the Master Plan.

The following are my comments:

No changes north of 520 freeway period.

No to a hotel to replace Azteca restaurant which would introduce prostitution and alcohol in a residential area where there is lots of kids.

No to more Microsoft intrusions and costly road construction for their employee automobiles. Plus staggered hours for employees at new buildings at 148 & 35thNE. If Microsoft is so great at solving business plans let them solve their own traffic mess.

Yes to a new configuration for Overlake Plaza (Sears area) can include a European style hotel/condo. Concept to include an all weather covered **walk to shops** and stores with underground parking for both retail and park & ride. More **bike paths**.

Yes to existing Group Health property for a Natural Park retaining existing landscaping plus one building for a teen and young adult community center to include dancing and communication ctr.

Yes to a sub police station at Overlake.

Yes to connecting the entire new concept to any future mass transit system connecting Redmond, Bellevue, and Seattle.

Lets not dumb down for the sake of a few developers and a quick fix.

Respectfully,

Herb Bentley, Sr. retired
50 yr. res.



City of Bellevue



Post Office Box 90012 ■ Bellevue, Washington ■ 98009 9012

May 30, 2007

Susan Petitpas, Chair, and Commission Members
Redmond Planning Commission
P.O. Box 97010
Redmond, WA 98073-9710

Also sent via Fax

Dear Chair Petitpas and Planning Commission Members,

As you are aware, the city of Bellevue has been watching with great interest the planning effort that Redmond has been undertaking to update the Comprehensive Plan policies and development guide regulations pertaining to the Overlake area. Bellevue and Redmond have over the years understood the joint interests and impacts the two cities have on each others' planning areas, and in particular the impacts of Overlake development on Bellevue, and the impacts of Bel-Red corridor development on Redmond. We are writing at this point to express our serious concerns about the timing of the proposed Plan and Code amendments now under study by the Redmond Planning Commission, and to request that this process be slowed down to a point that allows for the two cities' planned land use and transportation reconciliation process to take place.

Both Bellevue and Redmond are currently engaged in efforts to update each city's vision and plans for future development and redevelopment of the district that has long been recognized as a joint planning area shared between the two cities. This is the "BROTS" area, the subject of the existing Bel-Red/Overlake Interlocal Agreement that is in effect for our two cities through the year 2012. Both cities have agreed on numerous occasions that it is in our respective interests, as well as our obligations for interjurisdictional coordination under the Growth Management Act, to closely coordinate and work together to mitigate our cross-border impacts on each other's cities. Our two city councils have agreed in outline to engage in a land use and transportation reconciliation process to cover our cross-border impacts and mitigation for the period beyond expiration of the current BROTS Interlocal.

The timing issue has to do with ensuring that neither city takes premature actions that compromise the joint reconciliation process. This is a serious issue because until more joint work is conducted, we don't know the impacts of the two cities combined land use forecasts, whether the full forecast numbers can be accommodated or whether they may need to be revised downward; nor have we identified potential mitigation strategies and projects, or mechanisms to achieve potential mitigation.

This is not just an academic concern. In our respective planning efforts, each city has identified land use forecasts for the joint planning area that will accommodate significant future growth.

May 30, 2007

Page two

The preliminary preferred alternative for the Bel-Red Corridor, now under evaluation in a Final EIS, provides for 4.5 million square feet of commercial development and 5,000 housing units by the year 2030. The Overlake area preferred alternative, the subject of tonight's Planning Commission hearing on Plan and Code amendments, provides for an additional 4.5 million square feet of nonresidential development and 5,500 housing units through that same 2030 timeframe. A significant share of the Bel-Red trips generated in Bellevue, and the Overlake trips generated in Redmond, will use arterial capacity on the other city's street system. At this point, we simply don't know whether there is adequate capacity for this amount of combined land use to occur on these city arterials.

The land use and transportation reconciliation process between the two cities is intended to provide these answers. That is, can our joint land use plans be implemented without creating unacceptable cross-border impacts? Are there joint transportation projects that mitigate the cross-border impacts? If so, what is the appropriate role and share for each city in this mitigation?

To return to the timing issue before the Planning Commission tonight, our concern is that neither city take premature action to preclude a successful joint reconciliation process. Additional work is needed between the two cities to better understand the implications of our joint land use numbers. No policy or Code changes related to changes in overall land use capacity, including direct or indirect conclusions about the specific amount of land use to accommodate, building FARs, building heights, or other dimensional specifics should be put in place in policy or Code by either city until the joint reconciliation process has occurred. To do so would take key parameters off the table that need to be in place for a full reconciliation process between our two cities.

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on Redmond's draft Overlake package. We commented earlier on the Draft EIS issued for the Overlake Plan update, and we trust that these comments will be taken into consideration by the Planning Commission as well. We hope that both cities can work together to better synchronize our review and adoption processes so that our interlocal reconciliation and coordination process has the best possible chance to be successful.

Sincerely,



Matt Terry

Planning & Community Development Director



Gran Sparrman

Transportation Director

Lori Peckol

From: Amy Tarce [halcyonplan@msn.com]
Sent: Friday, June 01, 2007 1:12 PM
To: Lori Peckol
Cc: halcyonplan@msn.com
Subject: 2nd Installment of comments for OV Comp Plan Amendment

Lori,
 Here's my latest set of comments:

*Proposal would not
 allow parking lots
 on 152nd Ave NE*

Policy issue: parking lots along major pedestrian-oriented streets, including 152nd Ave. NE
 Instead of requiring a max. frontage of 50% of the street frontage, how about saying that the most parking allowed will be equivalent to a double-loaded parking lot at the side street or yard. My fear is that if you have a long street front, say, 500 feet (like Potter's property along 152nd and Bel Red), 50% is still 250 feet. To have this length without anything engaging the pedestrian will compromise the pedestrian friendly quality of the street. Just a thought.

Policy issue: Garages should not be allowed along major streets such as:

156th Ave. NE
 NE 24th
 148th Ave. NE
 NE 51st
 NE 40th
 Bel-Red Road

} will respond

A compromise would be to allow garages along 51st and 40th, but not at the intersection of 148th and 156th, and require additional buffering and setbacks, and high quality design of garages, just like what we did for Building 99.

Garages should not be visible from SR 520 (in other words, garages can still be located at the back of a property next to 520 but has to be heavily screened with trees and limited in height, just like what we did for Building 50)

*Inconsistent with approach
 Downtown*

Design Standard for retail:

Retail storefronts shall have windows that provide 100% transparency and provide views of the interior activity of the retail space from the sidewalk. This is crucial from my experience with RTC when the PetCo (whatever the name of that pet supply store is) moved into RTC. They claim to keep the glass windows, but they were going to block everything with large graphics. It would have effectively become a blank wall with a mural, instead of a true storefront, if not for the fact that RTC has a design standard requiring that storefronts show the activity inside the space.

Pedestrian plazas (RCDG 20D.40.200-090 2 (b) should include:

trash receptacles

Must be ADA accessible

Adjacent to a high pedestrian traffic area or designated pedestrian pathway system as defined in the OV master plan

} will respond

↑ Is proposed

06/20/2007

Thanks again for allowing me to provide input. Have a wonderful vacation.

Amy Tarce

06/20/2007

Comments Provided by former Redmond employee
now living in Virginia

Lori Peckol

From: Lori Peckol
Sent: Wednesday, June 20, 2007 5:43 PM
To: Planning Commission
Subject: FW: Overlake Village Comp. Plan Amendments

Study comments
noted

-----Original Message-----

From: Amy.Tarce@alexandriava.gov [mailto:Amy.Tarce@alexandriava.gov]
Sent: Thursday, May 31, 2007 5:55 PM
To: Lori Peckol
Subject: Overlake Village Comp. Plan Amendments
Importance: High

Lori,

I hope you had a good meeting last night and that the PC was willing to continue review of the proposed amendments until June. Here's the first installment of my comments for the OV Plan Amendments:

Group Health Site Plan Amendment (Attachment C):
page 2 of 15, under Master Development Plan, bulletpoints:

1. Land use plan should include building footprints
2. Transportation and circulation plan should include building entrances, loading docks and garage entrances. As a site plan reviewer, it is very hard to fully review how the circulation works if I don't know origins and destination points within the development and in connection to existing roads outside of the development. A well thought out site plan would have all these elements.
3. ADD new bullet point: "Significant and Landmark trees to be saved"

Will have at site
plan level; not master
plan

page 9 of 15, Bonus Features table:

Item 1 - LEED Certification can't be received by a project until a building is constructed. Developers want their Certificate of Occupancy when the building is completed but the USGBC may still be reviewing the project for certification. We cannot hold up the CO so what happens then? What happens if they don't get the Silver? (I understand City Hall hasn't gotten its Silver certification and its been 18 months since the building got its CO) Is there a penalty?

- Will respond

Item 3, suggested text in bold font - "Provide and maintain at least 10% of the retail floor area in the development for rents at 20% below market..."

- concern is too onerous

Item 4, parking below grade or in garages should be a requirement in the OV Village, not incentivized. Given the amount of density and FAR we expect, parking numbers to meet the parking needs of such developments will inadvertently mean large surface parking lots. If we truly want a successful walkable neighborhood in the OV Village, parking lots should not be allowed, just as this amendment will no longer allow drive-thrus and automobile service uses in the OV Village. However, because we want to encourage convenience retail and locally-owned restaurants, then maybe we can limit surface parking lots for them, but with additional design requirements.

- Will respond

Item 5, add as a criteria: "Is not used for screening or buffering parking lots or other visually undesirable features of the project" Also, if we are proposing to consider the large detention pond at the Sears site as open space, will they be getting a bonus then?

page 11 of 15, Item 8, Transit-oriented Development - This should be a requirement, not incentive-based, although criteria c may be an item justifying a bonus.

believe is appropriate

Note 4 on page 13 of 15. Streets, sidewalks and open space dedicated to the City should not be part of TDRs because PRDs customarily provide these without added benefits to the developer. It seems unfair that in the OV the owner of the property gets extra credit for dedicating what is commonly required as part of land development in other parts of the

as
man-
time

(Will respond

City. For open space, it should be clarified that they only get TDR benefits if they are providing open space above and beyond what is the minimum open space requirement (I'm assuming we are requiring the same open space ratio as what is required in the downtown?)

POLICY ISSUE 1: In order to have a successful light rail station, there has to be enough ridership, ergo, population. Hopefully, Microsoft employees will be willing to take a shuttle from the Main Campus and the West Campus to this station. However, that will be only be during rush hour. What happens on weekends, or midday or evenings? Maybe we should consider a minimum residential density requirement in the OV Village, within a 1/4 mile radius of the future light rail station. I recommend a minimum density of 100 du/acre (Cleveland Condos is at 180 du/acre), with a requirement to provide 10% affordable units at 80% of the median or 5% at 50% of the median HH income in King County. If we apply the same bonus system as in the downtown, this means they get another 10% additional bonus units, for a final density of 120 du/acre. I am concerned that the FAR requirement will not guarantee the density we want because the developer can build large condos. I think in the OV Village, we should stick with du/acre instead of FAR. *FAR is existing, unlikely to result in large condos*

I did a quick analysis of the 100 du/acre based on the following assumptions:

maximum height of 4 stories (can go up to accommodate the affordable units and bonus units) dwelling unit size of approx. 1,200 s.f. for a two-bedroom, 2 bath unit 20% of floor used for hallways, elevators, and HVAC spaces Impervious and lot coverage at 85% of lot area

Not possible
POLICY ISSUE 2: When a project has to exceed its maximum height without bonus in order to provide the required 10% affordable units, the s.f. of the affordable units should not be included in the calculation of required TDRs. *Prohibiting same standard as downtown*

POLICY ISSUE 3: For the areas within 1/4 mile of the OV Village transit center and future light rail station, consider a maximum parking ratio of 1 space/residential unit. But allow provisions for the developer to exceed this with the condition that they will pay \$10,000 for each additional space. The money will be deposited to a Green Initiatives fund that the City can use as subsidies for developers to pay for commissioning to get their projects LEED certified. Note that premiums for Green elements in buildings are decreasing, with encouraging estimates of 2 - 5% over the overall construction cost of conventional buildings. Minimum LEED certification is easily achievable (Silver is harder) so don't believe developers who say otherwise. It's the commissioning cost that most developers are unwilling to pay. Depending on how successful this is, we can implement the same requirement in the downtown area, within 1/4 mile radius of the transit center.

I have specific design standards for the OV Village and 152nd Ave. NE that I'm still working on and won't be able to give to you until tomorrow. Sorry for the deluge of comments on your last day before vacation.

Amy Tarce, AICP, Assoc. AIA
Principal Planner
City of Alexandria
Dept. of Planning & Zoning
(703)838-3866 ext.320
amy.tarce@alexandriava.gov

Daphne Harold

From: Jayme Jonas
Sent: Friday, June 08, 2007 9:26 AM
To: Daphne Harold
Subject: FW: Overlake Neighborhood Plan comments

-----Original Message-----

From: Jim Stanton [mailto:jstanton@microsoft.com]
Sent: Thursday, June 07, 2007 2:35 PM
To: Jayme Jonas
Cc: Lori Peckol; Lori Peckol; Don Marcy
Subject: RE: Overlake Neighborhood Plan comments

Jayme –

I'd like our letter and your response forwarded to the Planning commission. It demonstrates our involvement, even if we didn't get comments in in time, and shows that you have responded to our issues.

Jim S.

Jim Stanton, Sr. Community Affairs Mgr.
 425-707-5076 ; 425-708-2305 (fax)

Microsoft Real Estate and Facilities
 BUILDING INTELLIGENT SOLUTIONS

From: Jayme Jonas [mailto:JJONAS@redmond.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, June 06, 2007 3:28 PM
To: Jim Stanton
Cc: Lori Peckol
Subject: Overlake Neighborhood Plan comments

Jim,
 Thank you for your letter dated May 17, 2007 with comments on the Overlake Neighborhood Plan proposed policies and regulations. We wanted to get back to you regarding how we've responded to your comments in the proposals that are under review by the Planning Commission. Planning Commission began review of both the Overlake Neighborhood Plan amendment and the Group Health requested amendment on May 23. The public hearing began on May 30 and will remain open through at least June 20.

1. Building height: The regulations were modified to allow an additional floor, rather than specifying 15 feet. This is consistent with other places in the code that allow for a similar provision.
2. Convenience uses: The regulations related to signage for convenience service and retail uses were revised to allow for limited signage so that employees are aware of such businesses. The seating capacity for restaurants fitting this type of land use category was maintained so as to be consistent with similar seating capacity limitations for restaurants that serve primarily employees in other city zones. Restaurants that are solely for employee use do not have seating capacity limits.
3. Light rail stations: No revisions were made to Policy N-OV-36 discussing light rail stations. I believe that a follow up meeting was scheduled with you on this issue.
4. Parking near transit stations: No revisions were made to Policy N-OV-41 which suggests considering reducing or eliminating parking minimums for developments near transit stations. In this case, a maximum parking standard would still apply, but developers would be enabled to provide as much (up to the maximum) or as little parking as the market demands. Lessons may be learned related to this issue from the parking study currently underway for Downtown Redmond that could apply to Overlake.

6/8/2007

5. Parking: No revisions were made to Policy N-OV-43 which, in part, calls for monitoring the need for a residential parking permit system in the residential neighborhoods surrounding the Employment Area. We appreciate that Microsoft has never received a complaint from residents in these areas regarding parking, but recognize that some parking impacts could occur in these neighborhoods over time. This policy does not require such a parking permit program be established, but simply provides guidance to the City that this situation be monitored periodically in the future.

6. Multi-use trails: In response to this comment, staff revised the Administrative Design Flexibility (ADF) provision in the proposed regulations to apply to the Employment Area also. This allows for flexibility on sidewalks provided the request meets ADF criteria.

7. Intensity: "Moderate intensity" is generally described by regulations contained in the site requirements chart, such as allowed FAR, allowed height, building set-backs, etc.

8. Intensity: While "higher intensity" uses are not generally described in the site requirements chart or in other places in the Overlake regulations, this policy provides guidance for supporting and encouraging development that can support the existing transit station at NE 40th Street.

9. Employment Area parks: The 2 parks identified in the existing Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PRO) Plan are generally described as: one on the West side of SR 520, and one on the east side of SR 520 south of NE 40th Street.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions or comments.

Thanks,
Jayme

Jayme Jonas, Assistant Planner
Redmond Planning Department
15670 NE 85th Street, MS 4SPL
Redmond, WA 98073-9710
Phone: (425) 556-2496
Email: jjonas@redmond.gov

6/8/2007



May 17, 2007

Jayne Jonas, Assistant Planner
City of Redmond Planning Department
15670 NE 85th Avenue NE
Redmond, WA 98052

SUBJECT: Overlake Neighborhood Plan Comments

Dear Jayme;

Thanks for taking the time with us to review pending revisions to policy and site requirements on the Overlake neighborhood. As we discussed, Microsoft believes that there are opportunities to further improve the proposed regulations in the following areas:

1. 20C.45.40-050 (3)(a); Building Height – We recommend that the regulations be modified to allow an addition floor v. specifying 15 feet in the code. This would allow greater flexibility in floor-to-floor design in the future while maintaining the intent of the policy.
2. 20C.45.30.40, Permitted Land Uses – Convenience service and retail uses should be allowed to have sufficient signage and seating capacity to make them viable while maintaining the intent of not drawing numbers of customers from outside the district.
3. Policy N-OV-36, Transit – Microsoft believes that we should leave open the possibility of an additional light rail station at NE 51st/SR520 given the amount of commercial and residential (current and future) within walking distance of this location. With Microsoft's purchase and expansion of the former Safeco campus, and the potential that a developer could expand on the currently vacant Nintendo property, there is sufficient critical mass to support a station at this location.
4. Policy N-OV-41, Parking – Microsoft believes that reducing parking around transit stations may be the wrong solution. In many other light/heavy rail systems around the US transit agencies are adding parking given

additional user demand. In addition, if East Link terminates in Overlake, even for a short term period, traffic and parking will be drawn to this location, requiring additional parking in an area already under parked.

5. Policy N-OV-43, Parking – Microsoft does not believe a residential parking permit system is necessary given that even with current parking pressures on our campus we have never had a complaint from the Grass Lawn, Bridle Trails or Sherwood Forest neighborhoods on this issue
6. Policy N-OV-33 , Pedestrian & Bicycle Environment - Microsoft believes that in some cases this requirement may be redundant. For example, on 156th Avenue NE and NE 40th Street adjacent to our main campus sidewalks are sufficiently wide to allow multiple modes. Adding a foot or two to the sidewalks in these locations would not be as effective as using this funding for other locations where sidewalks are currently not available.
7. Policy N-OV-67, Employment Area - What is “moderate intensity”?
8. Policy N-OV-68, Employment Area - What is “higher intensity”?
9. Policy N-OV-75, Employment Area - Where exactly are the two parks proposed to be located in the Employment Area?

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the planning process for Overlake. Please contact me at 425-707-5076 if you need further clarification.

Sincerely,

Jim Stanton, Sr. Community Affairs Manager
Microsoft Real Estate & Facilities

Cc: - Don Marcy – Cairncross & Hemplemann



June 12, 2007

Redmond Planning Commission
c/o City of Redmond Planning Department
15670 NE 85th Avenue NE
Redmond, WA 98052

SUBJECT: Overlake Neighborhood Plan Comments

Dear Planning Commission Members:

Thank you for the continued opportunity to provide input to you regarding the Overlake Neighborhood Plan. We have previously submitted input in our May 17th letter and this correspondence should serve as additional perspective from the company. In particular, we have the following comments:

1. Section 20C.45.40-050, Height Limit Overlay – In part, this section would restrict building height to 35 feet within 300 feet of the OBAT District boundary. This regulation has direct impact on our properties on 148th Avenue NE, and NE 51st Street and significantly limits the potential develop ability of these and other properties in this area. We understand the rationale of protecting adjoining single family neighborhoods; however, this can be accomplished through a combination of strategies including distance, landscaping and berming together, which is less onerous than this proposal of using distance alone. In the case of Redmond West, much of this landscaping adjoining Sheffield Green is already in place today along both sides of 148th Avenue NE combined with planting in the median. As a result we believe this standard is overly onerous and should be reduced to allow a variety of strategies to accomplish this goal.
2. Pedestrian and Bicycle Improvements Map (page 24 of Overlake Master Plan and Implementation Strategy) – At present this map shows bike lanes designated through both the Microsoft Main Campus at Bel-Red. Rd. and the Redmond West Campus north of NE 51st Street. In addition, this designation is given to the Nintendo property adjacent to Redmond West which could indirectly impact our property. While we acknowledge the need to bike access for our employees, we cannot allow public

access, and the associated risk of the public, crossing our property. The only circumstance where we could entertain this option would be for the City of Redmond to extend indemnification to Microsoft for the use of these facilities. Secondly, since these are currently private roads that have not been built to include bike lanes we need the City to agree to help fund future improvements that accommodate these bike lanes in the future v. simply requiring them of future development.

3. Policy N-OV-75, Park designation south of NE 40th Street – Microsoft provides significant private active and passive recreation area on our extended campus for the use of our employees. Due to a variety of risk and liability issues we are not able to extend access to the public. We have discussed this issue with staff, and it is our understanding that the parks contemplated by N-OV-75 are not proposed on Microsoft property. If our understanding is incorrect, we object to the proposal to place the parks in these locations for the reasons cited above.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the planning process for Overlake. Please contact me at 425-707-5076 if you need further clarification.

Sincerely,

Jim Stanton, Sr. Community Affairs Manager
Microsoft Real Estate & Facilities

Cc: - Don Marcy – Cairncross & Hempelmann
Rob Odle, Lori Peckol – City of Redmond
Pat Sprague – Microsoft Real Estate & Facilities

Jayme Jonas

From: Austin Khan [akhan@otodevelopment.com]
Sent: Wednesday, August 15, 2007 2:56 PM
To: Jayme Jonas
Subject: Re: Overlake information

Jayme,

Thank you again so much for setting up yesterday's meeting. We look forward to getting our finalized site plan to you.

Here are a few comments from OTO that we would like to share with the planning commission regarding the planning department's work on revising hotel FAR in Overlake and the recommendations you plan to make:

- The revised hotel FAR of 1.2, with the ability to increase that FAR to 1.35 with incentives, makes upscale hotel development much more feasible in the Overlake area on sites that range from 0.75 to 4 acres. Development of quality hotels on sites that size would have been a great challenge with only a 0.36 FAR.
- The ability to use TDRs for a height increase to five stories is essential in having some flexibility to plan site layouts and maximize preservation of landscaping and trees, provide adequate fire and public safety access, and efficiently plan access to and from the site.
- Based on the revisions in the Overlake plan noted above, if approved, OTO plans to vigorously pursue opportunities to develop a new, 145 - 155 room hotel in the Overlake area and looks forward to providing updates to its proposal in the near future.

We strongly endorse the recommendations of the planning department and would like to give our support for its full approval.

I apologize again for not being able to deliver these comments in person. OTO appreciates all the work the planning department has done thus far to make this possible. If there's anything you need from me, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,
Austin

----- Original Message -----

From: Jayme Jonas
To: akhan@otodevelopment.com
Sent: Friday, August 03, 2007 1:21 PM
Subject: Overlake information

Austin-

Thanks for taking the time to talk with me today about the hotel proposal. Please let me know what your architect thinks of our idea.

Below is a link to the proposed Overlake development regulations. I thought a link to a website might be better

08/15/2007

than a giant attachment. The bonus incentive program begins on page A2-27; the plaza incentive which would get you to 1.25 FAR is on page A2-29. We will need to make a few revisions to the bonus incentive program as it is proposed now so that this incentive is available to your particular property & to revise the way the bonus FAR is stated. (This last revision would give a bonus of 0.19 FAR to those sites that chose to take advantage of the plaza incentive – this is equal to what sites would get now but is stated in a different way.)

http://www.redmond.gov/insidecityhall/boards/pdfs/pc/Overlake_ExA2.pdf

If the link doesn't work, please let me know.

I will have to talk with Lori a little more about how to get you a summary of Mirai's results. The way they reported things back to us was in the form of revisions to our SEIS – this might not be the most helpful thing for you.

Let me know if there's anything else I can provide.

Thanks,

Jayme

Jayme Jonas, Assistant Planner
Redmond Planning Department
15670 NE 85th Street, MS 4SPL
Redmond, WA 98073-9710
Phone: (425) 556-2496
Email: jjonas@redmond.gov

08/15/2007